

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26

CHRIS ANDERSON,
Appellant,
v.
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL AND
HEALTH SERVICES,
Respondent.

)
)
) Case No. ALLO-04-0019
)
) ORDER OF THE BOARD FOLLOWING
) HEARING ON EXCEPTIONS TO THE
) DETERMINATION OF THE DIRECTOR
)
)
)

Hearing on Exceptions. This appeal came on for hearing before the Personnel Appeals Board, WALTER T. HUBBARD, Chair, and GERALD L. MORGEN, Member, on Appellant's exceptions to the director's determination dated November 22, 2004. The hearing was held at the Department of Labor and Industries, 12806 Gateway Drive, Tukwila, Washington, on April 15, 2005.

Appearances. Appellant Chris Anderson was represented by Julie Sakahara, Area Representative of the Washington Federation of State Employees. Arturo Haro, Human Resource Manager, represented Respondent Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS).

Background. Appellant submitted a Classification Questionnaire (CQ) in August 2004, to DSHS Human Resources requesting that his position as a Developmental Disabilities Case/Resource Manager (DDCRM) be reallocated to the Social Worker 3 (SW 3) classification. By letter dated August 25, 2004, Tess Sample, DSHS Region 4 Human Resource Consultant, notified Appellant his position was properly allocated to Developmental Disabilities Case/Resource Manager classification. Ms. Sample determined that Appellant's duties were within the job specifications of the DDCRM classification and the classification was specifically established to encompass the

1 types of duties performed by Appellant, specifically, providing services to developmentally
2 disabled clients.

3
4 Appellant appealed the agency's decision to the director of the Department of Personnel, and on
5 November 1, 2004, Paul L. Peterson, Personnel Hearings Officer, held an allocation review. By
6 letter dated November 22, 2004, Mr. Peterson notified Appellant that his position was properly
7 allocated to the DDCRM classification. On December 14, 2004, Appellant filed an appeal with the
8 Personnel Appeals Board.

9
10 **Summary of Appellant's Argument.** Appellant asserts he performs the same duties as a Social
11 Worker 3. Appellant asserts that he uses the same programs, received the same training, and
12 manages his caseload in the same way as other Social Work 3s. Appellant asserts that the Division
13 of Aging and Adult Services no longer exists because it was merged with Development Disabilities
14 under the Aging and Disability Services Administration (ADSA) and that there are Social Worker
15 3s in ADSA. Appellant asserts it is unfair to classify him to the DDCRM classification when his
16 duties best fit the Social Worker 3 classification.

17 **Summary of Respondent's Argument.** Respondent disagrees that Appellant's duties are "nearly
18 identical to those of a SW3 located in Home and Community Services." Respondent argues that the
19 SW 3's who work with developmental disability in HCS work with children 18 years and younger,
20 carry a medically intensive caseload, represent the agency in court as expert witnesses and carry an
21 assigned caseload of 30:1. Respondent asserts that Appellant's duties differ and, more
22 significantly, are specifically addressed in the DDCRM classification specification. Therefore,
23 Respondent argues the director's determination should be affirmed, because position No. SQ40 is
24 properly allocated to the DDCRM classification.

1 **Primary Issue.** Whether the director's determination that Appellant's position is properly allocated
2 to the Developmental Disabilities Case/Resource Manager classification should be affirmed.

3
4 **Relevant Classifications.** Developmental Disabilities Case/Resource Manager, class code 35610;
5 Social Worker 3, class code 35220.

6
7 The definition for the class of Developmental Disabilities Case/Resource Manager states:

8 Within the Division of Developmental Disabilities, provides advanced level of
9 social services, specialized case and/or resource management for people who have
10 developmental disabilities and their families.

11 The definition for the class of Social Worker 3 states:

12 Within the Department of Social and Health Services, functions as a lead worker
13 or sole case manager in a remote location in either Aging and Adult Services or
14 Economic and Medical Services; or performs advanced level of specialized case
15 management in Children and Family Services or Aging and Adult Services. ...

16 **Decision of the Board.** The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification best
17 describes the overall duties and responsibilities of a position. A position review is neither a
18 measurement of the volume of work performed, nor an evaluation of the expertise with which that
19 work is performed. Also, a position review is not a comparison of work performed by employees in
20 similar positions. A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a particular
21 position to the available classification specifications. This review results in a determination of the
22 class which best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position. Liddle-Stamper v.
23 Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

24 After reviewing the CQ submitted by Appellant for position SQ40, we find that Appellant's duties
25 are consistent with the DDCRM class specification. As in our decision in Gesseini et. al v. Dep't.
26

1 of Social and Health Services, PAB Case No. ALLO-04-0012 (2005), we continue to hold that
2 while there are similar duties in the DDCRM and SW3 classifications, Appellant's position was
3 created for the purpose of performing Developmental Disabilities Case/Resource Manager work
4 and those duties are specifically addressed in the definition of the class specification. Although the
5 department restructured the former Developmental Disabilities Division, creating a subdivision
6 under the Aging and Disability Services Administration, the record supports that Developmental
7 Disabilities Case/Resource Managers remained under that subdivision, while social workers went
8 primarily to the Home and Community Services Division under the same administration.
9 Appellant has not met his burden of proving that position SQ40 should be allocated to the SW 3
10 classification.

11
12 **Conclusion.** The appeal on exceptions by Appellant should be denied, and the Director's
13 determination dated November 22, 2004, should be affirmed and adopted.

14
15 **ORDER**

16 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by Appellant is
17 denied, and the Director's determination, dated November 22, 2004, is affirmed and adopted.

18 DATED this _____ day of _____, 2005.
19

20 WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD
21

22 _____
23 Walter T. Hubbard, Chair

24 _____
25 Gerald L. Morgen, Member
26